P. F. 59 of 93.

G. R. S. IX-5]

Previous references.

1892-93.
~~192~~ .
(S. R.)

File No. 150 of 92

Serial Nos. 46.

Later references.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 1 to 11

In ~~Part~~ 3 for May 1894.

SUBJECT.

Appeal of Kadarappa of Betmangla, Bowring post Clerk regarding the sale of certain lands.

W D 2235 G P S —20,000—14-6-20

(9)

Appeals No 63, 73 & 93.

Appellant - Nasir Khan

The appellant has appealed against the proceedings taken by the Rating Committee of Nelson & Brierfield Municipal Borough Council in respect of the assessment made by them on his property. He says :—

(1) that in the proceedings which he says were commenced by the Committee on the 10th June, 1913, and from a determination arrived at on the 17th July, 1913, he was not duly notified of the hearing of the objection, and that he was thereby prevented from appearing before the Committee to support his objection.

(2) that the appellant at the Rating Committee's request attended the Justices' Room on the 17th July, 1913, and found a number of persons there, but that no hearing of objections was then proceeded with.

(3) that the proceedings of the Rating Committee in their assessments are most unsatisfactory in that they appear to have assessed property at a much higher rate than other property in the district.

(4) that they have increased the assessment of the first instance.

In his final appeal Justin presented an Order in Council, the applicable Regulations for entry by ship, and the Act under which they were passed by the Dominion. In a lengthy Memorandum for an experienced Minister the Application was framed to present the Immigration Act as a barrier of the many varieties of Immigrants to the Province. "It was all the more necessary to uphold this Provincial Barrier because the Dominion Act was the result of the Agitation in this Province" [illegible] Application was [illegible] accused as [illegible] in the Province. Now must be considered Application of delay in the transmission of Proceedings called for by the Appeal, and Petition for Order for the Release of the Prisoner, which is the petition presented to the Lieutenant Governor. The Petitioner [illegible] was drawn up by the Solicitor for the Dominion of Canada and [illegible] of the Dominion Government

Vide Privy Council's O.D. § 24-4-93.
In Re Rewandandra Gya in the matter of [illegible] that all the Regulations were necessary to enable Govt to come to a right conclusion on the question were

5

Appeal No. 106 of 1892-3

Appellant — Kesappa
Shantappa
of Betnangala
Bowringpet
Taluk.

Prayer

The appellant's appeal
against the sale of his
lands in satisfaction
of the arrears of revenue
amounting to Rs 232-14-6
due by him Betnan-
gala village from
Sasvadhan (1888-89)
to Khara (1891-92).
The points taken by
the petitioner in his
appeal petition and
the explanation of
the amildar thereon
are given below in
juxtaposition

Points in Re Appeal Feb. 6

1. The Appellant admitting the orders of his superior Officer dated 5th April 1891 has received from Rs accordi only 2 1/2 years revenue instead of four years

Appellant's Explanation

The Personal Assistant Officer in his order dated 6th April 1891 has directed only the collection of the balance after deducting two years Cowlgan of Rs 102-0-8 on the land sued in Civil Court decree. He has not directed the collection of 4 years Cowlgan. The Dy. Collector, ordered on 21.11.92 the collection from Rs accordi of Cowlgan from the date the said land came this possession which was ascertained Due 31.7.91; and two years Cowlgan since Mahalak Communicy Rs 22-2-11 was duly collected & credited to the Appellant's Khata. The portion of his land having been resumed by the Head Kharak during the Survey, the Rent old Rs accordi had been for above the Survey Cowlgan.

9

4/(6) The amount has been credited to the appellant's account of Rs 57-3-8 collected from the appellant's ryots on the date of the

The amount — 57-3½-8
which the appellant
admits as being
from his ryots
The amount — 36-14+3
which he says
not from his
ryots is made
up of the
amounts credited
from Banna
Reddi, have
all been duly
credited in the
treasury on
31-12-92 together
with interest
making up the
total — 111-12-3

22-2+11

110-4-10

1-7-5

The appellant's contention is
that credit should be given
therein for Rs 2[illegible] as the
twice the amount passed
by the Panchayatdar which
was collected from Basappa
while the actual collection
has been only Rs 22-2-11
as has been shown above.
The Dy. Commr. reports
in the terms of the above
explanation of the Amildar.

SRB
19/8/93

30.1.92 On the said date the following Survey Numbers were sold for Rs 333-4-0 viz 3½ guntas out of Survey No. 181, & Numbers 183, 244, 218, & 213. Applic. the Sale here came forward owners for S. Nos 244, 218, Page no. 82, and for Nos 181 & 183 producing Conveyance deeds & Stating that they had paid Condagam on these lands. He Sirastadar up the Sale Statement for the Confirmation of the Sale, the Sheristadar of the Taluk & who conducted the Sale remarked that as the Cultivators had not secured their lands by payment of Condagam the sold their lands in accordance with the Rules, and recommended that as receipt was produced for payment of Condagam on No. 244 the Sale thereof might be Cancelled & that Sale of other Numbers ~~confirmed~~ ~~the Sale of Nos 181 & 183~~ & 218 Confirmed, and also that the Sale of No. 213 Cancelled (Encroachers) appellants

5.3.92

P.S. hearing appeared & explained the Collr's order. He also suggested that the Appellant's own Kitale lands might be sold for the arrears still due.

30.6.92 The Dy. Commissioner called for the Plaintiffs' explanation for selling others' lands for the arrears due by the Appellant & cancelling the sale directed a fresh sale of the lands on which no bidders appeared.

9.7.92 The Plaintiffs explained that Nos: 181 & 183 were sold in accordance with the Land Office order, that the Claimant of No. 244 failed to produce his receipt for the payt. of Compensation, & that bidders appeared after the sale as regards the other Numbers. Also that he enclosed boat Sale Notices near the village for publication of the Auction, the Auctioneer

paid Rs 60 into the hands of the Sheristadar as a deposit, Sheristadar reported that any balance over this sum if there be might be received from Basse Reddy when he appears before the Talook for partition of these lands.

11.12.92

3.12.92 The appellant petitioned the Dy. Comm.r praying for time till march following for the amount due by him & offered personal security; also stating that he would be ready to deposit the amount at the end of the month.

7.12.92 The Dy. Comm.r directed the Amildar to give the pet.r one month's time on good security & report.

16.12.92 The Amildar reported that the appellant declined to give the called security & that if the appellant was allowed to remain the crops there would be difficulty in securing the arrears. Hence by him.

12

The Dy. Comm. 18.12.92
observing that the appellant
failed to avail himself
of the benefit of his
order, & directed that
the amount misappro-
priated by the appellant
being large, coercive
measures should at
once be adopted to
recover the sum.

Accordingly S. Nos. 21.12.92.
26, 145, 132, 328 & 43 were
sold on 21st Dec. 1892 &
Rs 343 realized; Likewise
days having elapsed 20.12.92.
for Nos: 443, 206, 469,
430, 210, 290, 471 & 101
were attached.

Ramasamy stated — do —
before me & said that
he was liable for the
Candayam on two Cows
he purchased in this
Cent only since the
date they came to his
possession i.e 31.7.91
(Vikruthi), that he had
cultivated the Nanjey
for 1 year about 4 years
previously & that he
Candayam for that
year

10

That the appellant's motive in stating that only a sum of Rs. 105-4-2 was due by him was to show discrepancy in the accounts & thereby gain the avenue of delay in the sale of the lands; that demand notice had been duly served on him; the Circular also referred the Dy. Comm. to the fact of how only months' time granted to the appellant by the Dy. Comm. was not availed of by him thus leading coercive measures being promptly adopted under the Dy Comm's orders and stated that under the circumstances the sale was only regular.

5.1.93

The Dy. Comm. denied the issue of an endorsement to the petitioner explaining the above circumstances, which was

has been duly done P. 1-93.

In submitting the 9\ - 2-93
sale proceedings the
Dy. Comm. the Auditor
reports that the
deposit amounts received
on account of sale of
Basavaraj's lands
had been returned.
The respective bids
in the sale, that the
Appellants' own whole
lands were sold in the
2nd Instance, that the
whole of the monies
of the sale had been
collected.
The Dy. Comm. 4-5-92
thereupon confirmed
the sale.

S.Vdl
20/10/93.

th

possession of certain lands on which he did not pay his dues. On this point, the appellant will be informed that once he is registered Khatedar, it is his duty to pay the money due on the lands and that he is at liberty to recover the sum due by Basavaraj through Civil Courts

[illegible]

[illegible] Secretary

Endorsement

Petitioner is informed that he is bound to pay the assessment on all lands standing in his name and that if any amount is due by Basavaraj he should recover the same through Civil Courts.

2. With reference to his complaint that lands were sold without due notice, Respondents have been called upon to show cause why the sale should not be set aside. The matter will be disposed of on hearing them.

Chief Secy.







Two Rupees Stamp

Case No I.

1. That the provisional statement of dues for the Belamangala village for '91 was placed before the Amaldar of the Belamangala Taluq for orders & the entire 6th April '92. directed that Rs: 10 = should be received from Devaraja and the balance from me.

2. That until yesterday no steps were taken to my recollection by the Amildar in the matter of the recovery of the dues as per above order.

3. That on the 18th ultimo a proclamation for sale of my lands was placed in my house for my signature

4. That I positively assert that the lands mentioned therein were different from those attached by the Revenue

5. That as I was then entangled in a Criminal case regretted the Amildar to grant me time to pay the dues after the case was over & accept personal security from me for the due payment of the dues.

6. The proclamation is for Rs: 5/2-0-0 but the dues

7. That Rs: 204 has to be paid by Bacanadi for 4 years while [redacted] -landi of [redacted] is under dispute as referred to in para 1 above.

8. That under the above circumstances I am liable only for Rs: 108-4-2 but not for Rs: 312-4-2 as per proclamation.

9. That I submit that the auction is prejudicial against me and is determined to ruin me.

10. That I submit herewith copy of my petition to the Deputy Commissioner and the copy of the telegram submitted by me yesterday. Exhibit-A. Exhibit-B Exhibit-C.

11. That my appeal to the Honorable Chief Court is posted to the 21st instant while the sale is for the 20th.

12. That I has given timely information to the auctioneer and the Deputy Commissioner to accept personal security for the amount due by me until March next.

13. That I have not as yet been intimated with the decision of the Deputy Commissioner on my applications and representations

14. That I apprehend that the auctioneer will sell my lands within 20 instant giving me no opportunity to arrange for its payment.

15. That the proclamation published a wrong proclamation and in direct contravention to the orders of the Commissioner [redacted] with a view deliberately

Cause amount Rs. 1 and Cause actually tried for.

16. That Counsel for the Deputy Commissioner may be directed to order the Assistant to stay sale until the decision of the Case is Called for & has been decided on its merits.

17. That as the sale is to come off tomorrow Counsel asks that a telegraphic order be sent to the Deputy Commissioner.

18. That Court fee telegraph stamps for Rupees 2.

Case No. II.

1. On the 19th July 1892 Ramlal & Bramingdeb served a notice on me for the payment of Rs. 1977-9-2.

× Exhibit D

2. I appealed against it to the Deputy Commissioner on the 26th July.

× Exhibit E

3. Case referred to the Munsiff by order dated 29th July.

× Exhibit E.

4. I submitted to the Deputy Commissioner on the 4th August a detail statement of accounts in support of my contention.

× Exhibit F

5. On the 14th October 1892 the Deputy Commissioner gave me an Endorsement that the case has not been finally settled.

× Exhibit B

6. On the 20th November 1892 I appeared personally before the Deputy Commissioner

has recorded my statement
in this matter.

7. Save as to my duty to have given directions for the arrest of any.

8. Amilcar, Alias, is determined to all cases mentioned in the proclamation referred to in Case No: I above and if the proceeds exceed Rs: 5/2-a-2 which only does he means to admit the amount in this case.

9. The proceedings of the District and other Revenue authorities being of a mere summary nature I beg for a telegraphic order to stop sale until I do present my representations and my appeal.

10. I have transmitted stamps to the value of Rs: 2-4-4 to cover the telegraphic Expenses.

I submit that the crop will have to be proceeded against for the recovery of Govt dues.

I beg to remain

Sir

Your most humble

& obedient servant

Signature illegible

Bangalore D/ Kadarapalli

19th December 1892

(General Serial No. 32.)

189 2.

No. 1531

Name of Petitioner. Viraraiya

Village.

Taluk.

District. Kanara

Date of Arzi.

Date of Receipt.

Date of Disposal.

No. of Enclosures. 7 / 1 Tele

ABSTRACT.

Prays that he may be given the lands and arrears of income may be credited in Telegram pending disposal of this Appeal —

We have considered the reasons which are necessary to entitle us to come to a final conclusion on the question the Petitioner has asked for ex plenation if the Sub had made an application earlier. He has considerable time to the date fixed for hearing & he calls upon us upon information we have little or no information before us, to take other ourselves the responsible duty of staying the sale according to his own statement. In addition his application to stay a sale ordered by the Collector - & not the sale by the Collector - & not the way in which we should exercise it & stay the proceedings under protest of the proceedings under protest of the Petitioner & not think that a fit case has been made out for our interference at this stage.

20 Dec 92 VR.

L. R. 150-92-1

19/12/92 Submitted for Orders

M

20/12/92

Mysore Govt. Central Press Bangalore—7-9-92,—1000.

No. 1531- 20
L.R. 150-92-2

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE,
PETITION DEPARTMENT,
23rd December 1892.
22

Endorsement granted to Kadarappa Shanbhog of Betamangala Bowringpet Taluk
in reply to his Petition Registered No. 1531 dated 19th December 1892

Petitioner is informed that the Government have not before them all the papers which are necessary to enable them to come to a right conclusion on the question. The Government might have called for explanation if the petitioner had made an application earlier. He has come before the Government on the day fixed for sale and he calls upon them, when they have little or no information before them, to take upon themselves the responsibility of staying the sale. Accordingly to his own statement he admits his liability to pay a portion of the money sought to be realized by the Amildar. The Government do not see why he should not pay it and pay the remainder under protest. They do not think that a good case has been made out for their interference at this stage.

2 The Enclosures are returned.

20/12/92

Draft as per Councillor's orders.

20/12/92

"By Order"

20/12

Chief Secretary.

20/12/92

Mysore Govt. Central Press, [redacted]-5-7-92—1000.

Pet 825-1

29-12-92
19-1-93.

(6)

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE

PETITION DEPARTMENT.

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

The accompanying Petition No. 1584

dated 23-12-92 received at the Dewan's Office from Kadirappa, Gab Thambagina of Belmangla, Bon halt Taluk, appealing against the Dy. Commrs order directing the sale of his property for the recovery of Govt dues from him

is forwarded, together with its 8 enclosures, to the Deputy Commr Kolar Dist. for submission of proceedings with a report on the facts of the case and on the points taken in the petition

2 The Petn should be returned

Hon Council case

By Order,

Chief Secretary.

BANGALORE,
19 January 1893.

M. G. C. P. Bangalore.—21-11-92—3,000.

From the Deputy C. to 55 28/1/93.

76. 40

Dated 26.-4-93.

To The Secretary
Kolar Gold

~~O.A.~~

L.Dr. 150-92-5

Legible photocopy of the original page can be provided on request

Bangalore,
26th April 1893. (7)

My dear Sir,

Enclosed, is copy of a petition Reg.r No. 2754 dated 22nd instant from Kadarappa Shanbague of Betamangal.

On his first petition, the records were called for in this Office No: 925 dated 17th January last. The records and report have not yet been received.

Surely, petitioner has cause for complaint and for want of the requisite information, Govt. cannot pass orders one way or together. Under the circumstances, it seems to me that you will be justified in directing sale to be postponed, attached property being kept under attachment pending disposal of the appeal before Govt.

Kindly order the report & papers to be sent up at once, or explain the delay if any is likely, still to accrue.

Kindly expedite reply.

Yours sincerely
(signed) T. Anandarao.

C. Madhava Esqre

Camp No: 35 Rec: 12

Deputy Commissioner's office,
Kolar District,
Dated 28th April 1893. (8)

77

To

The Chief Secretary to the
Govt of Mysore.

Sir,

Adverting to your official Memorandum No: Pet: 825 dated the 7th January 93, forwarding for report a petition from Kadirappa, Cattle-Shedding ryot of Betamangala, Bowringpet Taluk, appealing against this office order directing the sale of his property for the recovery of Government dues from him, I have the honor to state that the Retidarmenhas been lawfully executing the execution of a warrant issued on the Criminal side for his apprehension on a charge of criminal mis-appropriation by him of certain sums of Government money and until the warrant is executed no final report can be submitted in the matter of this appeal referred to above.

* herewith returned with its enclosures.

The active processes of which the Petitioner

complains have been initiated for the recovery of Rupees 49-50 being the amount of balances found in an examination of the accounts to be outstanding against the villages comprised in his aforesaid charge and regarding which he has utterly failed to render any satisfactory explanation. The Petitioner is clearly liable to make good his amount according to his own Kaifiat before one dated the 20th November 892 and the Bordereau Mudaraie Charge No. 2059 of the 22nd February 1893 copies whereof are herewith submitted for reference.

The various items comprising the aforesaid sum and how the Petitioner has rendered himself liable in respect of each, are briefly mentioned below:-

1 Balance against Nagarattinali Village not accounted for by the Petitioner. 5-14-6 / 49-50-2

In his Kaifiat, the Petitioner has clearly admitted his liability to make good his amount and has agreed to pay the same.

2. Amount of balances outstanding against Sadkarimar Kuruvi Pari Villages. 272-1-8

The remarks opposite 4(a) above are applicable to this. The guarantors named by petitioner appear to be fictitious

6. Balance outstanding against Retinuegala village for the period during which one Appuhamy officiated as the petitioner's Gumasta, viz: from January 1887-88 to December 1890-91). 802-8-5

The Petitioner stood security for the proper performance of the duties of Vidane by Appuhamy. He states that on the 8th April 1889 the petitioner the said Amidar required a curtailment of the security furnished by him and that he will make good the balance outstanding on that date minus that may be recovered by the attachment and sale of the Gumasta's property. There is nothing to show that the petitioner was released by competent authority from his obligations as surety and the Amidar reports that Appuhamy has no property that could be proceeded against for the recovery of the amount which must therefore be made good by the Petitioner. Appuhamy states that he officiated on the petitioner's responsibility and that the collections were

and all other important duties connected

with the village are performed in the latter.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

[signature]

Deputy Commissioner

Exhibit II

3 On the 6th Sept, 1892 Annexed hereto and marked Exhibit copy of order no: 30 & marked "A" publishing the contents of a proclamation prepared in conformity with Deputy Commissioners order in the matter of the alienation of petitioners property.

Exhibit III

4 The annexed proclamation dated 6th July 1892 prepared under Deputy Commissioners order no: 185 dated 5th July 1892 proclaimed that no one should accept alienation of immovable and immoveable properties from petitioners as it is likely that he will be made liable to the deficiency of large amounts of Government dues in his villages and if any body should accept the alienations they will be held responsible for the said Government dues. This was ordered to be stuck up in a conspicuous place in the village (vide Exhibit (unauthenticated) copy Authenticated copy having been presented to the Council

Satisfied with the accounts supported by vouchers (Vide unauthenticated Copy of the petition enclosed).

Exhibit E ? Deputy Commissioner referred the petitioner to the minister on the 28th July 92 (Vide unauthenticated Copy of Endorsement No: 32).

Exhibit II On the 6th August 1892 the petitioner submitted an explanation to the Deputy Commissioner in which he pointed out the following particulars.

Drawn from Kahu to Jarana both inclusive	33593-9-11
Deposit	29495-2-1
Collected and Credited from 1st April Kahu to 20th August 85 Partiira -	28705-5-4.
Total remission -	743-7-9.
Ja-Vishu 658-8-7	
Jarana. 84-15-2	
Total 743-7-9	
Sale proceed of lands sold in Chitrabhanu in Vikrama not collected	46-5-4

Total 2949 5-2-1

W7

Balance - 4098-7-10

The petitioner stated that he had furnished accounts to the deputy Commissioner for the said balance of Rs: 4098-7-10 that there was never Batayi cultivation in the villages and that he could never give reliance to the Kara'patti of Pramadi for Rs: 90-4-0 in the handwriting of Gnanasekharam or in the Talug Service but not verified by the officers who held the Sale nor of the unidar mentioned and of the Muttuvadi patti for Rs: 43-2-8 in the handwriting of the petitioners father bearing no signature of the then Talug authorities. Also point out that the petitioner is not responsible for the amount of Rs: 69-9-9 the Muttuvadi of the Pattu Velanam land for Chitarakkam, as he had no orders from the Talug to collect the said Muttuvadi for collection under the head Batayi. The petitioner was therefore not liable to pay anything to Government

No: 868 of 26th November 2
of the Deputy Commissioner
Gajanur & Nicks this is an
appeal has delivered by
the said Narayappa by the
Taluq Authorities on the
20th instant preventing it
to the 18th.

Petitioner submits
that he has been improperly
dealt with and solicits that
the entire proceedings be
called and a thorough
Enquiry be held before he
is made liable for the
deficiency of Rs: 1124-1-6
and pending final disposal
of this appeal as the Commis
would deem proper, the
Deputy Commissioner be
directed not to take
further steps in the matter
of the attachment and sale
of the petitioners property

5.1.

A

(A)

(B)

(C)

(C)

4

7 ਦੀ ਬਿਨਾਂ ਤੇ ਮੁਦਈ ਦਾਅਵਾ ਕਰਦਾ ਹੈ ਕਿ ਉਸ ਨੇ ਮੁਦਾਲਾ ਨੰਬਰ 1 ਤੋਂ ਸੰਨ 1885 ਈ: ਵਿਚ ਮੌਜਾ ਮਜਕੂਰ ਵਿਚ 210 ਕਨਾਲ 8 ਮਰਲੇ ਜ਼ਮੀਨ ਮਾਲਕਾਨਾ ਹੱਕ ਵਿਚ ਖਰੀਦ ਕੀਤੀ ਸੀ ਅਤੇ ਉਸ ਦੇ ਹੱਕ ਵਿਚ ਇੰਤਕਾਲ ਨੰਬਰ 1885 ਤਸਦੀਕ ਹੋਇਆ ਸੀ ਅਤੇ ਉਸ ਦੇ ਹੱਕ ਵਿਚ ਰਜਿਸਟਰੀ ਹੋਈ ਸੀ ਅਤੇ ਉਸ ਦੇ ਹੱਕ ਵਿਚ ਇੰਤਕਾਲ ਨੰਬਰ 1885 ਤਸਦੀਕ ਹੋਇਆ ਸੀ ਅਤੇ ਉਸ ਦੇ ਹੱਕ ਵਿਚ ਰਜਿਸਟਰੀ ਹੋਈ ਸੀ

7 ਦਰਜ ਰਜਿਸਟਰ ਹੈ ਜਿਸ ਦੀ ਰੂ ਤੋਂ ਮੁਦਈ ਦਾਅਵਾ ਕਰਦਾ ਹੈ ਕਿ ਉਸ ਨੇ ਮੁਦਾਲਾ ਨੰਬਰ 1 ਤੋਂ ਸੰਨ 85-86 ਈ: ਵਿਚ ਮੌਜਾ ਮਜਕੂਰ ਵਿਚ ਜ਼ਮੀਨ ਮਾਲਕਾਨਾ ਹੱਕ ਵਿਚ ਖਰੀਦ ਕੀਤੀ ਸੀ ਅਤੇ ਉਸ ਦੇ ਹੱਕ ਵਿਚ ਇੰਤਕਾਲ ਨੰਬਰ ਤਸਦੀਕ ਹੋਇਆ ਸੀ ਅਤੇ ਉਸ ਦੇ ਹੱਕ ਵਿਚ ਰਜਿਸਟਰੀ ਹੋਈ ਸੀ ਅਤੇ ਉਸ ਦੇ ਹੱਕ ਵਿਚ ਇੰਤਕਾਲ ਨੰਬਰ ਤਸਦੀਕ ਹੋਇਆ ਸੀ ਅਤੇ ਉਸ ਦੇ ਹੱਕ ਵਿਚ ਰਜਿਸਟਰੀ ਹੋਈ ਸੀ

ਦਰਜ ਰਜਿਸਟਰ ਹੈ ਜਿਸ ਦੀ ਰੂ ਤੋਂ ਮੁਦਈ ਦਾਅਵਾ ਕਰਦਾ ਹੈ ਕਿ ਉਸ ਨੇ ਮੁਦਾਲਾ ਨੰਬਰ 1 ਤੋਂ ਸੰਨ 85-86 ਈ: ਵਿਚ ਮੌਜਾ ਮਜਕੂਰ ਵਿਚ ਜ਼ਮੀਨ ਮਾਲਕਾਨਾ ਹੱਕ ਵਿਚ ਖਰੀਦ ਕੀਤੀ ਸੀ ਅਤੇ ਉਸ ਦੇ ਹੱਕ ਵਿਚ ਇੰਤਕਾਲ ਨੰਬਰ ਤਸਦੀਕ ਹੋਇਆ ਸੀ ਅਤੇ ਉਸ ਦੇ ਹੱਕ ਵਿਚ ਰਜਿਸਟਰੀ ਹੋਈ ਸੀ ਅਤੇ ਉਸ ਦੇ ਹੱਕ ਵਿਚ ਇੰਤਕਾਲ ਨੰਬਰ ਤਸਦੀਕ ਹੋਇਆ ਸੀ ਅਤੇ ਉਸ ਦੇ ਹੱਕ ਵਿਚ ਰਜਿਸਟਰੀ ਹੋਈ ਸੀ

ਸੁਰੀ ਦੇ ਸਿਵਿਲ ਜੱਜ ਦੀ ਅਦਾਲਤ ਵਿੱਚ ਸ੍ਰੀ ਰਾਜੇਸ਼ ਕੁਮਾਰ ਦੀ ਤੈਨਾਤੀ ਦੌਰਾਨ

ਸੀ.ਆਰ.ਪੀ.ਸੀ. ਦੀ ਧਾਰਾ 1 ਤੋਂ 1 ਤੱਕ ਦੇ ਅਧੀਨ ਦਰਜ ਕੀਤੇ ਗਏ ਕੇਸਾਂ ਦੀ ਸੂਚੀ

ਜਿਨ੍ਹਾਂ ਵਿੱਚ ਫੈਸਲੇ ਸੁਣਾਏ ਗਏ

ਲੜੀ ਨੰ.	ਕੇਸ ਨੰਬਰ	ਧਾਰਾ	ਪਾਰਟੀਆਂ ਦੇ ਨਾਂ	ਫੈਸਲੇ ਦੀ ਮਿਤੀ
1	1	1	1	1
2	2	2	2	2
3	3	3	3	3
4	4	4	4	4
5	5	5	5	5
6	6	6	6	6
7	7	7	7	7
8	8	8	8	8
9	9	9	9	9
10	10	10	10	10

ਸਹੀ/-

ਸਿਵਿਲ ਜੱਜ, ਸੁਰੀ

ਮਿਤੀ 1 ਅਪ੍ਰੈਲ 2026

ਨੋਟ: ਇਹ ਸੂਚੀ ਸਿਰਫ਼ ਨਮੂਨੇ ਲਈ ਹੈ। ਅਸਲ ਰਿਕਾਰਡ ਅਦਾਲਤ ਦੇ ਰੀਡਰ ਕੋਲ ਉਪਲਬਧ ਹੈ।

ਸੁਰੀ ਦੇ ਸਿਵਿਲ ਜੱਜ ਦੀ ਅਦਾਲਤ ਵਿੱਚ ਸ੍ਰੀ ਰਾਜੇਸ਼ ਕੁਮਾਰ ਦੀ ਤੈਨਾਤੀ ਦੌਰਾਨ

ਸੀ.ਆਰ.ਪੀ.ਸੀ. ਦੀ ਧਾਰਾ 1 ਤੋਂ 1 ਤੱਕ ਦੇ ਅਧੀਨ ਦਰਜ ਕੀਤੇ ਗਏ ਕੇਸਾਂ ਦੀ ਸੂਚੀ

ਜਿਨ੍ਹਾਂ ਵਿੱਚ ਫੈਸਲੇ ਸੁਣਾਏ ਗਏ

ਲੜੀ ਨੰ.	ਕੇਸ ਨੰਬਰ	ਧਾਰਾ	ਪਾਰਟੀਆਂ ਦੇ ਨਾਂ	ਫੈਸਲੇ ਦੀ ਮਿਤੀ
1	1	1	1	1
2	2	2	2	2
3	3	3	3	3
4	4	4	4	4
5	5	5	5	5
6	6	6	6	6
7	7	7	7	7
8	8	8	8	8
9	9	9	9	9
10	10	10	10	10

ਸਹੀ/-

ਸਿਵਿਲ ਜੱਜ, ਸੁਰੀ

ਮਿਤੀ 1 ਅਪ੍ਰੈਲ 2026

ਨੋਟ: ਇਹ ਸੂਚੀ ਸਿਰਫ਼ ਨਮੂਨੇ ਲਈ ਹੈ। ਅਸਲ ਰਿਕਾਰਡ ਅਦਾਲਤ ਦੇ ਰੀਡਰ ਕੋਲ ਉਪਲਬਧ ਹੈ।

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 22/23 – 2 – 93 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

ಮೇಲಿನ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆಯ ಪತ್ರದಲ್ಲಿ ಕೋರಿರುವಂತೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಸೂಚನೆಗಳನ್ನು ನೀಡಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಅಲ್ಲದೆ ಈ ಕಚೇರಿಯಿಂದ ಸಹ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಸೂಚನೆಗಳನ್ನು ನೀಡಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಈ ಕಚೇರಿಯಿಂದ ಸೂಚನೆಗಳನ್ನು ನೀಡ

Tel
1091

28-2-93

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE,

PETITION DEPARTMENT.

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM. (13)

71

L. R. 150-92-8

The accompanying Petition No. 1887
dated 18/1/96 — 93 received at the
Dewan's Office from Kadarappa, Shanbo
Balamangala, Bowringpete
Enlist, Cheluvaraya against the
Deputy Commissioner in the
matter of exemption from
ejectment from certain lands
is forwarded, together with its Seven
enclosures, to the Deputy Commr
Kolar Dist for submission
of Proceedings with a report on the
facts of the case and on the
points taken in the petition
2 The Petition claimed be
returned.

By Order,

Draft.

for Chief Secretary.

BANGALORE, 24
Oct 1893

B Ellis

J. G. C. P. Bangalore.—21-11-92—3,000.

Disposed of vide Case No. 3426 of 11-5-93
844

(General Serial No. 30.)

OFFICE OF THE
13273
15 MAY 93
1893
Petn 542
DEWAN OF MYSORE

From The Deputy Commr
Nelamangalam

To (14)

The Chief Secretary to the Dewan of Mysore.

Dated 12th May 93

Despatched 13th Do

Received

Enclosures No. 1 file

General No. 3496
No. 844

In reply to

SUBJECT.

Reporting on the petition from Madanagiah late Shanbogue of Bettamangala Amanigatta Dacca.

Petn
Circa
15/5

L. R. 150-92-10

References (to be entered only in the Dewan's Office).

73

In the appeal suit of 73 Srinivasa & the 3rd appeal proceedings taken for recovery of Sirsi Rents are recorded for by them, were advised of the Minute (Sirsi Rents & other Items).

The appeal suit of the decree of Rs. 232-4-0, arrears of Rent due to him in the 2 years of this Rent. He contends that the arrears amounted only Rs. 56-12-0.

The facts taken at the Trial are explained in the Judgment.

The Munsiff said that Srinivasa in 1889 and the 3rd appellant before him the same year a decree of 1892 in any further pleadings & appl.

Both the Judgments

[illegible] the means
Shiffre Munsiff in Enquiry
Warrant Issued

Asst Commissioner
(Adl) Chitradurga
24/5

Post the case for hearing
24/5/93

Collector's Office 24/5/93

Robs 350
191

transferred to the next Khanate."

4. With regard to the petitioner's allegations that the Amildar has failed to furnish him with copies of the records connected with the Encumbrance against that office, report that the delay in granting the copies applied for was due to the non-appearance of the petitioner either in person or by agent to receive them in consequence whereof he was told to send the same to the Taluk Sheristadar for delivery to the applicant whose movements have of late become uncertain.

5. The petitions referred to by the appellant in para 5 of his petition as having been addressed to this office were all duly considered but they proved nothing in extenuation of his liability.

6. The appellant alleges in para 7 of his petition that the Amildar has failed to credit to his account Rupees 5-3-8 collected from his ryots on the 20th December 1892 but the Amildar reports that his amount was duly credited on the 31st December 1892 in part adjustment of the arrears due by the appellant.

7. The Amildar's Enquiry No. 10 dated the 25th March 1893, reporting on each of the grounds urged

by the appellant as this appeal petition is herein submitted for further reference and obliging petition when no longer required.

8 The petitioner is at large as has already been reported, and if he has any further to urge on his behalf, shall be glad to give him a hearing when he appears before me, he personally or by agent.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

[signature]

Deputy Commissioner

IV The Deputy Commissioner has not decided my petitions dated 18th December 1892 and 2nd December 1892 and 10th January 1893 which explain the irregular proceedings of the Taluq & District authorities and which contain all the grounds of my contention.

Exhibits E and E'

V. That the appellant is only liable to pay Rs: 56 - 12 - 6 and not Rs: 282 - 4 - 6 mentioned in the order appealed against.

VI The Amildar has failed to credit to my account the amounts collected by him on the sale of Vale (20 trees) from my estate (amounts 5/3 - 5 out of Rs: 68 - 1 - 11 -)

From the terms of the order appealed against, from the remarks observed by the Dy Commr in the matter of disposing my petitions referred to in para IV above the appellant fears that justice will not be done to him in the district

The appellant under the foregoing circumstances

(over)

Exhibit - A.

18

Exhibit B

ਨੰ.	ਵਸਤੂ ਦਾ ਵੇਰਵਾ	ਵਰਤੋਂ ਯੋਗਤਾ			ਅਨੁਮਾਨਿਤ ਕੀਮਤ	ਪ੍ਰਾਪਤ ਕੀਤੀ ਕੀਮਤ	ਟਿੱਪਣੀ
		ਚੰਗੀ	ਸਧਾਰਨ	ਮਾੜੀ			
੧	ਕੰਪਿਊਟਰ ਕੁਰਸੀ ਸਮੇਤ ਮੇਜ਼						

ਨਮੂਨਾ

Exhibit-C

ਅਦਾਲਤ ਸ਼੍ਰੀ ਸੁਖਦੇਵ ਸਿੰਘ ਜੱਜ ਸਾਹਿਬ

ਸਿਵਲ ਜੱਜ (ਜੂ.ਡ.) ਫਤਿਹਗੜ੍ਹ ਸਾਹਿਬ

ਸਿਵਲ ਕੇਸ ਨੰਬਰ ੧੨੩ ਮਿਤੀ ੧੫-੦੭-੨੦੧੭

ਸ਼੍ਰੀ ਰਾਮ ਲਾਲ ਪੁੱਤਰ ਸ਼੍ਰੀ ਹਰੀ ਰਾਮ ਵਾਸੀ ਪਿੰਡ ਮੰਡੀ ਗੋਬਿੰਦਗੜ੍ਹ

ਬਨਾਮ

ਸ਼੍ਰੀ ਮੋਹਨ ਲਾਲ ਪੁੱਤਰ ਸ਼੍ਰੀ ਗੋਪਾਲ ਦਾਸ ਵਾਸੀ ਪਿੰਡ ਖੇੜੀ ਨੌਧ ਸਿੰਘ

ਦਾਅਵਾ: ਸਥਾਈ ਮਨਾਹੀ ਦਾ ਹੁਕਮ

ਸੰਖੇਪ ਤੱਥ

ਵਾਦੀ ਦਾ ਦਾਅਵਾ ਹੈ ਕਿ ਉਹ ਪਿੰਡ ਮੰਡੀ ਗੋਬਿੰਦਗੜ੍ਹ ਵਿਚ ਖਸਰਾ ਨੰਬਰ ੪੫ ਦੀ ਕਨਾਲ ੩ ਮਰਲੇ ਜ਼ਮੀਨ ਦਾ ਮਾਲਕ ਹੈ ਅਤੇ ਉਸ ਉੱਤੇ ਪੱਕਾ ਮਕਾਨ ਬਣਿਆ ਹੋਇਆ ਹੈ। ਪ੍ਰਤੀਵਾਦੀ ਨੇ ਉਸ ਦੇ ਮਕਾਨ ਦੀ ਪਿਛਲੀ ਕੰਧ ਨਾਲ ਲੱਗਦੀ ਥਾਂ ਉੱਤੇ ਨਾਜਾਇਜ਼ ਉਸਾਰੀ ਸ਼ੁਰੂ ਕਰ ਦਿੱਤੀ ਹੈ।

ਵਾਦੀ ਦਾ ਕਹਿਣਾ ਹੈ ਕਿ ਇਸ ਉਸਾਰੀ ਨਾਲ ਉਸ ਦੇ ਮਕਾਨ ਦੀ ਨੀਂਹ ਕਮਜ਼ੋਰ ਹੋਣ ਦਾ ਖ਼ਤਰਾ ਹੈ ਅਤੇ ਬਰਸਾਤ ਦੇ ਪਾਣੀ ਦਾ ਨਿਕਾਸ ਵੀ ਰੁਕ ਜਾਵੇਗਾ। ਉਸ ਨੇ ਪਹਿਲਾਂ ਜ਼ੁਬਾਨੀ ਅਤੇ ਫਿਰ ਲਿਖਤੀ ਤੌਰ ਉੱਤੇ ਪ੍ਰਤੀਵਾਦੀ ਨੂੰ ਰੋਕਿਆ, ਪਰ ਉਹ ਨਹੀਂ ਰੁਕਿਆ।

ਪ੍ਰਤੀਵਾਦੀ ਦਾ ਕਹਿਣਾ ਹੈ ਕਿ ਉਹ ਆਪਣੀ ਹੀ ਜ਼ਮੀਨ ਉੱਤੇ ਉਸਾਰੀ ਕਰ ਰਿਹਾ ਹੈ ਅਤੇ ਵਾਦੀ ਦੇ ਮਕਾਨ ਨੂੰ ਕੋਈ ਨੁਕਸਾਨ ਨਹੀਂ ਪਹੁੰਚਾ ਰਿਹਾ। ਉਸ ਨੇ ਦਾਅਵੇ ਦਾ ਵਿਰੋਧ ਕੀਤਾ ਹੈ।

ਮੁੱਦੇ

੧. ਕੀ ਵਾਦੀ ਖਸਰਾ ਨੰਬਰ ੪੫ ਦੀ ਜ਼ਮੀਨ ਦਾ ਮਾਲਕ ਹੈ ਅਤੇ ਉਸ ਉੱਤੇ ਪੱਕਾ ਮਕਾਨ ਬਣਿਆ ਹੋਇਆ ਹੈ?

੨. ਕੀ ਪ੍ਰਤੀਵਾਦੀ ਵੱਲੋਂ ਕੀਤੀ ਜਾ ਰਹੀ ਉਸਾਰੀ ਨਾਲ ਵਾਦੀ ਦੇ ਮਕਾਨ ਨੂੰ ਨੁਕਸਾਨ ਪਹੁੰਚਣ ਦਾ ਖ਼ਤਰਾ ਹੈ?

੩. ਕੀ ਵਾਦੀ ਸਥਾਈ ਮਨਾਹੀ ਦੇ ਹੁਕਮ ਦਾ ਹੱਕਦਾਰ ਹੈ?

੪. ਕੀ ਵਾਦੀ ਨੇ ਪਹਿਲਾਂ ਰੋਕਣ ਵਿਚ ਦੇਰੀ ਕੀਤੀ ਹੈ ਜਿਸ ਨਾਲ ਉਸ ਦੀ ਰਾਹਤ ਦਾ ਹੱਕ ਘਟਦਾ ਹੈ?

੫. ਕੀ ਵਾਦੀ ਨੇ ਲੋੜੀਂਦੀ ਕੋਰਟ ਫੀਸ ਅਦਾ ਕੀਤੀ ਹੈ?

ਫੈਸਲਾ

ਮੁੱਦਾ ਨੰਬਰ ੧ ਤੋਂ ੫ ਤੱਕ ਦਾ ਫੈਸਲਾ ਇਕੱਠਾ ਕੀਤਾ ਜਾਂਦਾ ਹੈ।

ਵਾਦੀ ਵੱਲੋਂ ਪੇਸ਼ ਕੀਤੇ ਗਏ ਜ਼ਮੀਨ ਦੇ ਇੰਤਕਾਲ ਅਤੇ ਮੌਕੇ ਦੀਆਂ ਫੋਟੋਆਂ ਤੋਂ ਇਹ ਸਾਬਤ ਹੁੰਦਾ ਹੈ ਕਿ ਵਾਦੀ ਖਸਰਾ ਨੰਬਰ ੪੫ ਦਾ ਮਾਲਕ ਹੈ ਅਤੇ ਉਸ ਉੱਤੇ ਪੱਕਾ ਮਕਾਨ ਬਣਿਆ ਹੋਇਆ ਹੈ। ਪ੍ਰਤੀਵਾਦੀ ਵੱਲੋਂ ਉਸਾਰੀ ਉਸ ਮਕਾਨ ਦੀ ਪਿਛਲੀ ਕੰਧ ਨਾਲ ਲੱਗਦੀ ਥਾਂ ਉੱਤੇ ਹੋ ਰਹੀ ਹੈ, ਜਿਸ ਨਾਲ ਨੀਂਹ ਕਮਜ਼ੋਰ ਹੋਣ ਦਾ ਖ਼ਤਰਾ ਹੈ। ਵਾਦੀ ਨੇ ਪਹਿਲਾਂ ਰੋਕਿਆ ਸੀ ਅਤੇ ਦੇਰੀ ਦਾ ਕੋਈ ਠੋਸ ਕਾਰਨ ਨਹੀਂ ਦੱਸਿਆ ਗਿਆ। ਕੋਰਟ ਫੀਸ ਵੀ ਅਦਾ ਕੀਤੀ ਗਈ ਹੈ।

ਹੁਕਮ

ਉਪਰੋਕਤ ਵਿਚਾਰ ਅਨੁਸਾਰ ਵਾਦੀ ਦਾ ਦਾਅਵਾ ਮਨਜ਼ੂਰ ਕੀਤਾ ਜਾਂਦਾ ਹੈ। ਪ੍ਰਤੀਵਾਦੀ ਨੂੰ ਹੁਕਮ ਦਿੱਤਾ ਜਾਂਦਾ ਹੈ ਕਿ ਉਹ ਆਪਣੇ ਏਜੰਟਾਂ, ਨੌਕਰਾਂ ਅਤੇ ਕਿਸੇ ਵੀ ਹੋਰ ਵਿਅਕਤੀ ਰਾਹੀਂ ਵਾਦੀ ਦੇ ਮਕਾਨ ਦੀ ਪਿਛਲੀ ਕੰਧ ਨਾਲ ਲੱਗਦੀ ਥਾਂ ਉੱਤੇ ਉਸਾਰੀ ਕਰਨ ਤੋਂ ਸਥਾਈ ਤੌਰ ਉੱਤੇ ਮਨਾਹੀ ਕੀਤੀ ਜਾਂਦੀ ਹੈ। ਖਰਚੇ ਦੀ ਰਕਮ ਪ੍ਰਤੀਵਾਦੀ ਵਾਦੀ ਨੂੰ ਅਦਾ ਕਰੇ।

ਸੁਖਦੇਵ ਸਿੰਘ

ਸਿਵਲ ਜੱਜ (ਜੂ.ਡ.) ਫਤਿਹਗੜ੍ਹ ਸਾਹਿਬ

ਸਾਰਾਂਸ਼ ਅੰਗਰੇਜ਼ੀ ਵਿਚ ਲਿਖੋ।

ਪ੍ਰਸ਼ਨ 2. ਸੰਖੇਪ ਨੋਟ ਲਿਖੋ।

ਪ੍ਰਸ਼ਨ 3. ਪੰਜਾਬ ਦੇ ਕਿਸੇ ਪ੍ਰਸਿੱਧ ਲੋਕ ਨਾਚ ਬਾਰੇ ਲਿਖੋ।

ਪ੍ਰਸ਼ਨ 4. ਪੰਜਾਬ ਦੇ ਕਿਸੇ ਪ੍ਰਸਿੱਧ ਲੋਕ ਨਾਚ ਬਾਰੇ ਲਿਖੋ।

ਪ੍ਰਸ਼ਨ 5. ਪੰਜਾਬ ਦੇ ਕਿਸੇ ਪ੍ਰਸਿੱਧ ਲੋਕ ਨਾਚ ਬਾਰੇ ਲਿਖੋ।

ਪ੍ਰਸ਼ਨ 6. ਪੰਜਾਬ ਦੇ ਕਿਸੇ ਪ੍ਰਸਿੱਧ ਲੋਕ ਨਾਚ ਬਾਰੇ ਲਿਖੋ।

ਪ੍ਰਸ਼ਨ 7. ਪੰਜਾਬ ਦੇ ਕਿਸੇ ਪ੍ਰਸਿੱਧ ਲੋਕ ਨਾਚ ਬਾਰੇ ਲਿਖੋ।

ਪ੍ਰਸ਼ਨ 8. ਪੰਜਾਬ ਦੇ ਕਿਸੇ ਪ੍ਰਸਿੱਧ ਲੋਕ ਨਾਚ ਬਾਰੇ ਲਿਖੋ।

ਪ੍ਰਸ਼ਨ 9. ਪੰਜਾਬ ਦੇ ਕਿਸੇ ਪ੍ਰਸਿੱਧ ਲੋਕ ਨਾਚ ਬਾਰੇ ਲਿਖੋ।

ਪ੍ਰਸ਼ਨ 10. ਪੰਜਾਬ ਦੇ ਕਿਸੇ ਪ੍ਰਸਿੱਧ ਲੋਕ ਨਾਚ ਬਾਰੇ ਲਿਖੋ।

Case no 1

Exhibit E

No. 2

C. Ramaswami Esq

Kalar district

Sir,

With reference to the Land Acquisition proclamation in the matter of Sale of my land for the recovery of arrears of Revenue due from [illegible] and to intimate that following gentlemen [illegible] for Earnest money [illegible] the Land sale auction by my representatives decided) :--

1. That the proclamation has been made in the Kalar Taluk Office and [illegible] that the land belonging to [illegible] that I have received Earnest money [illegible] that I have deposited Earnest money [illegible] security for the amount due by me (vide [illegible] statement) dated 8th [illegible] the Belakavadi Village for 1951 until after the Criminal proceedings against me are terminated.

2. I submitted a petition to [illegible] my representatives did not [illegible] further until [illegible]

to my representation in the
proclamation of sale
and my petition to you
dated 22nd November 25
that the sale as per
proclamation is to come
off within 20th instant.
That I am prepared
even now to furnish
personal security for
the amount drawn in
para 7 above Rs: 108-0-0

12. That I should be granted
time under Sec: 41 Para
8 of Land Revenue Rules
as I am stuck up in
Bangalore in connection
with the appeal in the
Chief Court and thus
being unable to arrange
for the payment of the
dues.

I beg to remain Sir
(Sd) Kamarajapa

Bangalore
18th December 25

"Copy"

(Sd) Kamarajapa

3. That I have not been favored with your decision in Either of the above Cases.)

4. That the Applicants have prejudiced against me.

5. That I am positive to term that the Applicant has not placed before you any case fully.

6. That the Applicant must given attention to the orders of the Jamadar officer dated 6th April 91 in the matter of the said claim, in the Territorial Settlement of the Patamangala Village dated 6th April 1891.

7. That under the above mentioned Survey No: 108-A-2 and not No: 312-A-2

8. That the Applicant is prejudiced to Continue by selling any land in unfavourable seasons.

9. That the Applicant misguided up to date to Communicate to me any, if any,

Form Extract

Kadarappa

Bangal

rait Esq. I.C.S.
Commissioner
alur District
Kolar Road.

ms is not guaranteed: the sender must a
, errors or delays.
his telegram to the Telegraph Check Office, Calcutta,
osing this receipt.
h Guide (price 4 annas.)

Sir adverting to ... in Chief Court ... 21 instant x ... my representation re sale proclamation 18 ultimo and petition of ... for 22 ultimo not decided x claim adjournment of sale 41 Revenue Rules x submitted this direct Amildar being prejudiced x detail petition pasted.

18th December 1892 — I, Kadarappa

"True copy"

(Signature)

I/d/ Kadarappa

Exhibit F

To,

C. Madiah Esq.

Deputy Commissioner

Kolar District

Kolar

Sir,

I beg to submit that decree in suit Lakshmaiah of Betamangala and other villages I am a land holder in Betamangala. In connection with a civil dispute against one Basireddi Patel of Kuruburalli obtained a decree and in satisfaction thereof the lands mortgaged thereto sold. As Basireddi purchased them in the said sale with permission of the court, he has liable to pay to Government the assessment of those lands though the Patta has not been issued to him.

2 In may last the Amildar of Bowringpet served me with a notice for Revenue Arrears of R. 14-2-2 - He took no steps until March last. I paid Rs: 29-10-7 as it only amounts due by me was intimated that the balance should be remitted from Basireddi.

3. The above circumstances were placed before the District Collector for orders who directed the Amildar vide 5th April last that a requisition should be made to the civil court for the adjustment of the arrears of Revenue due on the lands out of the sale proceeds, the same being the first charge on the land. As the requisition was not complied with he has ordered to sell the lands once again for the Revenue arrears. I enclose certified copy of the Collectors order.

4 On the 30th January 1892 the said lands were sold for Rs. 154 - but the amount was withheld as non-bona-fide bidder took with reference to the famine affairs accepting of April 1891 a mystery

5 On the 15th December 1892 a proclamation was placed in my hand for the sale of my lands & chattels & stores in the enjoyment of Bacharaj for arrears of Rs: 3,12 - - - 2 inclusive of the amount due by Bacharaj. I was surprised upon that such irregular proceedings as issuing proclamation without notice & service, and attachment of stores & crops were ordered in the Collector's Court without pointing out the security by seizing my objections on the proclamation itself. I need not point to his representation and the proclamation was cancelled. I represented upon my hardships and solicited your gracious time by accepting personal security from me for my arrears. I heard that you were pleased to over the Omission & stay sale and to grant me Famine time on tangible security. This over the Omission did not convey me although he knew that I was staying in Bangalore in connection with a Criminal appeal before the Civil Court. The Omission however Collector under 20th instant in conformity with his proclamation and if that I have heard as a fact in direct contravention to your kind orders granting me time.

6 The following, Sir, is the result of the sale on the 20th instant :-

S. No.	A. C	Market Value	Highest bid
29	" 7	52.8.-	10 - - -
43.	" 16	500 - - -	109 - - -

This is a copy concerning of 40 of all shown this special kinds one Sheriff on Rs: 500/-

1892. 93. [illegible] 1378/1301.

Rejected. The petition is improperly worded. It is not for the petitioner to criticise the action of Government officials. The Court confine himself to the representation of his grievances if any.

(Signed) C. H.

2nd Jan. 93.

Exhibit Go

Is

To

A. Inadicale Esq.

Deputy commissioner

Kolar

Sir

My appeal petition to you of the 27th ultimo representing my grievances and the irregular procedure of the Taluq subordinates was returned to me with your indorsement No 1978/1301 of the 2nd instant, rejecting the same as being improperly worded and pointing out that it was not for me to criticize the actions of Govt officials.

You have marked some portions in paras 5, 8, & 9 of my appeal petition. I had no evil motive in wording those portions in my appeal but that to explain the injustice done to me by the Taluq authorities, my appeal grounds being based on the irregular actions of the Amildar. If you have found those portions improper I beg to withdraw the same. However resubmit my application for your early orders as I apprehend that similar return of my appeal would probably effect the time under Limitation act and allow opportunity to the confirmation of the sale, appealed against with all the irregular procedure of the Amildar and his subordinates

The following abstract (from informations gathered by me subsequent to the date of my appeal petition) will enable you to pass your final orders on the Amildars record in the matter of the arrears alleged to be due by me by the Amildar.

Total amount of arrears as per proclamation dated 18th November 1892.	Rs as per 312 - 0 - 2
Deduct arrears for recovery from Basa Radi as per orders of the Jamabandi officer dated 6th April 1891 (copy attached to my appeal.)	204 - 0 - 0
Balance	108 - 0 - 2

Details of collections made by the Amildar and account of my arrears.

13-4-93

1164

1035

ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ: ಕೆಆರ್‌ಐಡಿಎಲ್/ಟೆಂಡರ್/ಜಿಲ್ಲಾ ಕಚೇರಿ/2024-25/ಸಂ.ಕ್ರ.ಯೋ.ಯೋ/ಟೆಂಡರ್ ಸೂಚನೆ/ಕಾಮಗಾರಿ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ-3

ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಗ್ರಾಮೀಣ ಮೂಲಸೌಕರ್ಯ ಅಭಿವೃದ್ಧಿ ಯೋಜನೆ (ಕೆಆರ್‌ಐಡಿಎಲ್)

ಜಿಲ್ಲಾ ಕಚೇರಿ, ಸಂಕ್ರಮಣ ಯೋಜನೆ ಯೋಜನಾ ಘಟಕ, ಮಲ್ಲಿಗೆಪುರ ಜಿಲ್ಲೆ

ದೂರವಾಣಿ: 08152-240118 | ಇಮೇಲ್: krida.mallige@karnataka.gov.in

ದಿನಾಂಕ: 21-11-2024

ಟೆಂಡರ್ ಸೂಚನೆ

ಕಾಮಗಾರಿ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ-3 — ಮಲ್ಲಿಗೆಪುರ ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಯ ಕಸಬಾ ಹೋಬಳಿಯ ಹೊಸಕೆರೆ ಗ್ರಾಮದಿಂದ ಹಳೆಕೆರೆ ಗ್ರಾಮದವರೆಗೆ 7.2 ಕಿ.ಮೀ. ಉದ್ದದ ಗ್ರಾಮೀಣ ರಸ್ತೆಯ ಅಭಿವೃದ್ಧಿ ಕಾಮಗಾರಿ

ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಗ್ರಾಮೀಣ ಮೂಲಸೌಕರ್ಯ ಅಭಿವೃದ್ಧಿ ಯೋಜನೆ (ಕೆಆರ್‌ಐಡಿಎಲ್) ಜಿಲ್ಲಾ ಕಚೇರಿ, ಸಂಕ್ರಮಣ ಯೋಜನೆ ಯೋಜನಾ ಘಟಕ, ಮಲ್ಲಿಗೆಪುರ ಜಿಲ್ಲೆ ಇವರಿಂದ ಅರ್ಹ ಮತ್ತು ನೋಂದಾಯಿತ ಗುತ್ತಿಗೆದಾರರಿಂದ ಮೊಹರು ಮಾಡಿದ ಟೆಂಡರ್‌ಗಳನ್ನು ಆಹ್ವಾನಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಕಾಮಗಾರಿಯು ಹೊಸಕೆರೆ ಗ್ರಾಮದಿಂದ ಹಳೆಕೆರೆ ಗ್ರಾಮದವರೆಗೆ ಒಟ್ಟು 7.2 ಕಿ.ಮೀ. ಉದ್ದದ ಗ್ರಾಮೀಣ ರಸ್ತೆಯ ಅಭಿವೃದ್ಧಿಯನ್ನು ಒಳಗೊಂಡಿದೆ. ಕಾಮಗಾರಿಯ ಅಂದಾಜು ಮೊತ್ತ ₹ 1,84,50,000/- (ಒಂದು ಕೋಟಿ ಎಂಬತ್ತನಾಲ್ಕು ಲಕ್ಷ ಐವತ್ತು ಸಾವಿರ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳು) ಆಗಿದ್ದು, ಕಾಮಗಾರಿಯನ್ನು 365 ದಿನಗಳ ಅವಧಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಪೂರ್ಣಗೊಳಿಸಬೇಕು. ಟೆಂಡರ್ ಸಲ್ಲಿಕೆಗೆ ಕೊನೆಯ ದಿನಾಂಕ 12-12-2024 ಮಧ್ಯಾಹ್ನ 3 ಗಂಟೆಯವರೆಗೆ ಇರುತ್ತದೆ.

ಅರ್ಹತಾ ಷರತ್ತುಗಳು: ಗುತ್ತಿಗೆದಾರರು ಕನಿಷ್ಠ ₹ 1 ಕೋಟಿ ಮೌಲ್ಯದ ಒಂದೇ ಕಾಮಗಾರಿಯನ್ನು ಕಳೆದ ಐದು ವರ್ಷಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಪೂರ್ಣಗೊಳಿಸಿರಬೇಕು. ಕಳೆದ ಮೂರು ವರ್ಷಗಳ ಸರಾಸರಿ ವಾರ್ಷಿಕ ವಹಿವಾಟು ಕನಿಷ್ಠ ₹ 2 ಕೋಟಿ ಇರಬೇಕು. ಗುತ್ತಿಗೆದಾರರು ಕೆಆರ್‌ಐಡಿಎಲ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಕನಿಷ್ಠ ‘ಸಿ’ ದರ್ಜೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ನೋಂದಾಯಿತರಾಗಿರಬೇಕು. ಕಾಮಗಾರಿ ಪ್ರಾರಂಭವಾಗುವ ಮೊದಲು ಅಂದಾಜು ಮೊತ್ತದ ಶೇಕಡಾ 10ರಷ್ಟು ಮೊತ್ತದ ಇಎಂಡಿ ಅಥವಾ ಬ್ಯಾಂಕ್ ಗ್ಯಾರಂಟಿಯನ್ನು ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಬೇಕು.

ಕಾಮಗಾರಿಯ ಪ್ರಮುಖ ಅಂಶಗಳು: ರಸ್ತೆಯ ಒಟ್ಟು ಉದ್ದ 7.2 ಕಿ.ಮೀ. ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ 3.5 ಕಿ.ಮೀ. ಉದ್ದಕ್ಕೆ ಡಾಂಬರು ಕಾಂಕ್ರೀಟ್ ಹಾಕಲಾಗುವುದು. ಅಗಲ 5.5 ಮೀಟರ್ ಇರಲಿದ್ದು, ಎರಡೂ ಬದಿಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ತಲಾ 1.5 ಮೀಟರ್ ಅಗಲದ ಮಣ್ಣಿನ ಭುಜಗಳನ್ನು ನಿರ್ಮಿಸಲಾಗುವುದು. ಒಟ್ಟು 4 ಕಿರು ಸೇತುವೆಗಳು ಮತ್ತು 2 ಕಲ್ವರ್ಟ್‌ಗಳನ್ನು ನಿರ್ಮಿಸಲಾಗುವುದು. ಕಾಮಗಾರಿಯ ಸಮಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಂಚಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಪರ್ಯಾಯ ವ್ಯವಸ್ಥೆ ಕಲ್ಪಿಸಬೇಕು. ಕಾಮಗಾರಿಯ ಸ್ಥಳದಲ್ಲಿ ಸೂಚನಾ ಫಲಕ ಅಳವಡಿಸಬೇಕು.

ಟೆಂಡರ್ ದಾಖಲೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕೆಆರ್‌ಐಡಿಎಲ್ ಜಿಲ್ಲಾ ಕಚೇರಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವುದೇ ಕೆಲಸದ ದಿನದಂದು ಕಚೇರಿ ವೇಳೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಪರಿಶೀಲಿಸಬಹುದು. ಟೆಂಡರ್ ಪ್ರತಿಯನ್ನು ₹ 1,000/- ಪಾವತಿಸಿ ಪಡೆಯಬಹುದು. ಟೆಂಡರ್ ಸಲ್ಲಿಕೆಗೆ ಕೊನೆಯ ದಿನಾಂಕ 12-12-2024 ಮಧ್ಯಾಹ್ನ 3 ಗಂಟೆ. ಅದೇ ದಿನ 3.30ಕ್ಕೆ ಟೆಂಡರ್ ತೆರೆಯಲಾಗುವುದು. ಅಪೂರ್ಣ ಟೆಂಡರ್‌ಗಳನ್ನು ತಿರಸ್ಕರಿಸಲಾಗುವುದು. ಯಾವುದೇ ಟೆಂಡರ್ ಅನ್ನು ಕಾರಣ ನೀಡದೆ ತಿರಸ್ಕರಿಸುವ ಹಕ್ಕು ಕೆಆರ್‌ಐಡಿಎಲ್‌ಗೆ ಇರುತ್ತದೆ.

ಸಹಿ/-
ಎಂ. ಕೃಷ್ಣಮೂರ್ತಿ
ಕಾರ್ಯನಿರ್ವಾಹಕ ಎಂಜಿನಿಯರ್
ಕೆಆರ್‌ಐಡಿಎಲ್, ಮಲ್ಲಿಗೆಪುರ ಜಿಲ್ಲೆ

ਸਾਰੇ ਸਾਰੇ ਸਾਰੇ

(1)

(2)

(3)

96

V13678

[redacted]

Govt were unable to pass orders one way or another and that under the circumstances it seemed the Dy Commr would be justified in directing sale to be postponed, attached property being kept under attachment pending disposal of the appeal before Government.

In his report Compt No 35 dated 28th April 1893 the Deputy Commr states that a charge of Criminal misappropriation of Govt money is pending against the appellant, that appellant has been wilfully evading the execution of a warrant issued for his apprehension, and that until he surrenders himself no final report can be submitted in the matter of his appeal. A brief explanation of the circumstances under which sums aggregating Rs. 2470-5-8 are claimed, is however given in the report.

The points for consideration are:
1) Whether at this stage an appeal lies to the Council, inasmuch as there has been no sale and clause 29 of Sec. I of the Add. Rules does not apply, and as proceedings have

apparently been taken under section 25 (chap III) of the Land Rev Code clause 18 but does not seem to apply (2) whether the appeals can be heard inasmuch as the appellant has not surrendered himself to legal process, & there is no final report.

4/5

Solicitor for Crown (Rev) (vide D/O)

4/5

Submitted

4/5

Petitioner has not shown sufficient cause for our interfering in the matter at this stage.

Let endorsement may be given to the Petitioner that he should appear in person or by Vakil before the Dt Court & represent her case, & if he is not satisfied with the order passed by them he may appeal against it in due course.

5/5/93

Read this for Mr J. Chelyan's approval

5/5/93

5/5/93

5/5

5/5/93

5

The Amildar has failed to observe the preliminary steps required in re matter of recovering the arrears by coercive measures —

The lands mortgaged to Bazaaredy were duly attached & sold for the amount due Government but he having represented to the Dy. Comm. that he was ready to pay the Government that the sale was irregular the Dy. Commissioner directed the collection of the dues from the date the said lands came to Bazaaredi's possession & enjoyment.

The Amildar has failed to furnish the applicants with copies of papers applied for —

The applicants' statements have become uncertain & the copies therefore could not be given directly; he petitioner that he same could be handed over to his brother or two others, who would pay the cost; but did not know respectively, & the copies had to be sent to the applicants

The Dy. Comm. has not received his explanation concerning allegations of irregularities in repairs of Wadas & District

Endt. No: 1478/1301 dated 2nd Jany 1878, has issued to the applicants from the District office, that it

(5) The appellant is only liable to pay Rs 56·12-6 and not Rs 232-14-6 —

it was not for him to ... the action of the Govt Officials ... he should confine ... self to the representation of his grievances.

The appellant's ca... later is:

Amount due by him as per proclamation of 18.12.92	302
Deserted and ordered to be deducted from Kasaredy 4 years' Candaram	204
also amount collected by amildar on a/c of appellant's arrears but credited alleged not having been credited thereto	51
Total deducts.	255
Balance	56-12

But according to the ac... in the Taluka;

Amount due by appellant vide Khara including interest &c	344
Amount recovered from Kasaredy & others & credited to appellant's khata	111
Balance still due.	232

10

A.S. No. 8 of 1892-93

Appellant - Kadrappa
Late Shanbogue
of Betmangala
Bowring pet
Taluk.

The facts of the case are as follows: —

On 22nd May 1890 a demand notice was issued against the appellant for a revenue arrear of Rs 171-15-2. The appellant remarked on the back of the notice that the lands on which revenue was due had been sold to others & that in consequence he was not liable therefor

19.1.91 The Shekdar reported that a sum of Rs 221.5-0 was due by the appellant & that he would neither pay up the amount though demanded several times nor point out the lands on which the amount was due.

and

and suggested the attach-
ment and sale of the
appellants' Khate lands.

The Amildar accordingly 22·7·91
issued a sale proda-
mation including therein
the appellants' lands
and stated as regards
two numbers which
had been sold by the
Civil Court, that should
the arrears thereon be
not paid by the Civil
Court out of the proceeds
of the sale, the lands
should again be attached
in the Revenue side
as per Jamabandy Rules
orders.

The Shekdar reported that 24·8·91
the appellant evaded
signing the sale procla
mation & that a further
sum of 90 Rs had fallen
due on his lands for
the Vikhute & requested
the issue of a fresh
proclamation including
the appellants' move-
able property also.

The ~~first~~ Judge Amildar 23·10·91
finally fixed 28th January
1892 for the sale & issued a
proclamation: and

Proclamation published 6

on

14

7/ 8.9.92 Amldar in accordance with Re Dy. Commrs. order issued a fresh Sale proclamation and included therein Survey nos. 213 & 244 and another fixed the Sale for 28th Oct 1892. The Sale could not take place on this date & was post-poned to 20th Dec. 1892 & further arrears included in the proclamation 23 Re amounts due for 10 yrs. Savaşeli, Virodi, Vekunt & Khara. On Re back of this proclamation Re appellant remarked that Re numbers which had appeared in a previous proclamation did not appear on Re, that Dasreddy should pay Re arrears on Re numbers which he has purchased in Re first lot Sale accordg to Re Jamabandy Officers' order, & that himself wanted two months time either to pay Re demand against him or to explain Re same

16.11.92 Proclamation published

as he had been engaged
in a civil case
& one Venkatappa &
another Venkatarangappa
remarked that Nos.
213 & 210 were theirs

15

16.11.92 The appellant petitioned
the Dy. Commr. that
Basaveddy might
be made to pay the
arrears due on the
lands he purchased
in the civil court
Sale & prayed that
only those numbers
on which arrears
had accrued might
be sold.

10	No 29.	7	
60	10	24	
16	13	8	
60	328	15	
107	43	16	
253	sold for		

21.11.92 The Dy. Commr. accordingly
issued orders to the
amildar that Basaveddy not
pay up the arrears
on the said lands the
Sale thereof would be
confirmed and as
regards the other
arrears repeated his
order of 30.6.92

3.12.92 This was communicated
to Basaveddy thro'
the Shekdar, & thus man
(Basaveddy) having
paid

18

year had been paid by the appellant. That the amount due by him came to only Rs 23-9-11 nett, whereas he had paid payment as deposit Rs 50-0-0 the balance being due to him, and that he had again told the Numbers & Naraimha Char & another & Company should be received from them.

20-12-92 Four ryots Anche Hanumappa & others also deposed to the effect that Basava-reddy had cultivated & taken the crop on these lands for 1 year some 6 years back & that subsequently the appellant only was taking the crop.

18-12-92 On 18th the appellant has petitioned the Dy. Commr that only Rs 108-0-2 was due by him & complained of the Amildar's action in attaching more lands than was necessary

+ 1

and larger sum than was
actually due being
put down against him
The Dy. Commr. having 21. 12
called for a report he
Amirdas explained
as follows:—
All the lands in the
appellants' Khata
had been attached
& only 5 selected numbers
were sold; that only
two years' Candayam
could be demanded
from Kassaredy as
the arrangement between
him & the appellants
as regards the former
having cultivated
the land for 1 year
previously could not
be ascertained;
that the sale proclamation
contained the details
the arrears against
appellants who had
it without re-
ing his objection;
2nd sale procla-
contained in addition
rent for Khara;
that

+ 113-8-" × upto Ver
89-6-" for Vikum
9-7-" Imam Kan
20-"-" "Chand
30-"-" price of
262-5-" in ele
balan

and larger sum than was
actually due being
put down against him
The Dy. Commr. having 21. 12 - 92.
called for a report, the
Amildar explained
as follows: —
All the lands in the
appellants' Khata
had been attached
& only 5 selected Numbers
were sold; that only
two years' Candayam
could be demanded
from Sassaneedy as
the arrangement between
him & the appellant
as regards the former
having cultivated
the land for 1 year
previously could not
be ascertained;
that the sale proclamation
contained the details +
of the arrears against
the appellant who had
signed it without re-
marking his objection;
that the 2nd Sale procla-
mation contained in addition
the amount for Khara;

that

+ 113-8-" × upto Vrisch
89-6-" for Vikrutu
9-7-" Iram Kani
20-"-" Chandum
30-"-" price of bu

262-5-" included balance

(17)

Petition N° of 1892-93.

Appellant
Kadarappa
of
Kolar District

Respondents
1. Shanbhog Subbamma.
2. Kasamballi Basa Reddy
3. Venkatamunneappa
4. Venkatappa.

Appellants lands Nos 29, 105, 132, 328 and 43 were sold for arrears of Revenue and the complaint is that the sale was irregular and that it should therefore be set aside.

Notice of demand required by Sec 158 of the Revenue Code was served on the appellant on 22nd May 1890. In this notice the amount due is stated to be Rs 142-2-2. The amount demanded not having been paid certain lands of appellant were attached and sold on 30th January 1892. In the sale proclamation however the lands are stated to be liable for sale on account of arrears of Rs 283-15-5, which included a fine of Rs 20. and Rs 30. the value of trees cut. The sale was however cancelled on the complaint of third parties Without any further notice to the appellant, other lands were attached

Punnadkam	Rs 45-0-4
Virodhi	— 84-3-9
Notice fee	— 1-0-0
Virodhi	— 41-11-5
Total	Rs 171-15-2.
Deduct collection	29-13-0
Balance	142-2-2

attached and sold on 21st December 1892. and in the sale proclamation which is dated 16th November 1892, the amount of arrear due is stated to be Rs 312-0-3. Appellant noted a remark in the sale proclamation, that he had not received any notice of the amount stated to be due, that he does not owe it, and that the sale should be stopped, but no notice was taken of this remark and the lands were sold, at which respondents purchased them for Rs 253.

Gavadhari .. Rs 45-
Vinodhi ——— 67-
Vibuthi ——— 90-
Khara ——— 109-
Total Rs 312-

3. Government consider that the second sale of the lands without a fresh Demand was irregular, especially as the amount, for which the sale took place was in excess of the sum mentioned in the first notice as well as in the sale Proclamation. A notice will therefore be issued to the Respondents to shew cause why the sale should not be cancelled.

4. Appellant contends that a portion of the money said to be due by him, has to be paid by 2nd Respondent Basareddy, because he had

possession

29 (22)

Read agn decree
on Mr. 15 & 4 of 1892-93

Appt
Vadivutta

Respt
1 Vasudev
2 Subbanna
3 Venkatramappa
4 Venkatappa

Respts not having shown cause
why the sale should not be cancelled
it is hereby cancelled as prayed
Cert should at once proceed
for the recovery of the arrear. The purchase
money will be refunded
to Respt

26/2/94

Mr is referred to the Dy
Cert who has been requested
to cancel the sale & proceed
afresh against the appt for
the recovery of the arrear

32

(15)

(General Serial No. 32.)

1892.

No. 1584

Name of Petitioner. Kadirappa & Shanbhog of Betmangala, Bowringpet Taluk

Village. Bangalore

Taluk.

District.

Date of Arzi. 23/12/92

Date of Receipt. 24/12/92

Date of Disposal.

No. of Enclosures. 8.

ABSTRACT.

Petitioner appeals against the Kolar Dy. Commissioner's order No 368 of 26.11.92 directing the Amildar to attach and sell Petitioner's property for the recovery of the deficiency of revenue for which the Petitioner was liable.

A.C.

Mysore Govt. Central Press Bangalore—7-9-92,—1000.

(General Serial No. 30.)

26

1893.

125-29. (8)

From

The Deputy Commissioner
Kolar District.

To

The Chief Secretary to the Dewan of Mysore.

Dated 28
Despatched 29 } April 1893
Received

Enclosures No. 12

Camp
~~General~~ No. 35 1892-93
No.

In reply to

SUBJECT.

Submitting a report on the Petition from Kadirappa, late Shanbhog of Betamangala, appealing against the Deputy Commissioner's order directing the sale of his property for the recovery of the Government dues due by him.

Petn for Remn 30/4

References (to be entered only in the Dewan's Office).
Sent to the Chief Secretary with a minute.
BR 4/5.

D. R. 150-92-6.

Raghavendra Row Jahsildar of Honnavar
Taluk, Bellary District, is the registered Shan-
-bhogue of these villages and the duties of the
office seem to have been entrusted to the peti-
-tioner with effect from the year Vikrama
(1880-81).

The Petitioner has in the abovementioned
Kaifiet agreed to pay the amount shown
under this item which represents the portion
of the outstanding balances relating to the
period of his incumbency and he states that
the remainder viz:- Rupees 52-11 should be
recovered from the registered shanbogue who
is alleged to have arranged separately
for the discharge of the duties connected with
the villages during the period for which the
same is due.

3. Balance against Byatarayanhalli village. } 105-6-2

Rama Row, a Police constable employed
in the Chintamani Taluk is the Baramadar
Shanbhogue of this village. The Petitioner
while admitting that he had been perform-
-ing the duties of the office as a gumasta
contends that the balance should be recovered
from the registered Shanbhogue who in his turn
urges that as the Petitioner had for a period

of 30 years been doing duty as a gumasta appointed by Government the latter (Petitioner) is responsible to make good the amount.

4. Balances outstanding against Belamangala village on account of Batayi revenue:-

Item (a) The Petitioner states that he could not find Kulwar particulars for this sum and that he would abide by the orders of Government regarding the same. 515-5-11

Item (b) ——— 445-14-1

The Petitioner stated that he had Kulwar details for this sum except for Rupees 69-9-9 and that if the individuals concerned denied their liability to pay it, he would make good the same.

The Amildar who held an enquiry into the matter under orders from this office reports that none of the persons named by the Petitioner were found liable to pay the money or any part thereof.

Item (c) ——— 5-15-3

The Petitioner could not furnish any explanation in regard to this item and is liable to make good the amount.

5- Balance against Betamangala village on account of the sale-proceeds of certain lands sold in satisfaction of the arrears of revenue due to Government. 46-5-11

(4)

1584 RC 1/9
24-12-92



To,

Two Rupees stamps

The Honorable members
of the Maharaja's Council.
Bangalore

A.S.No 73
92-93

Honored Sirs

This is an appeal against the decision of the deputy Commissioner Kolar district dated 26th November 1892 referred to in the accompanying copy of Bowringpet Amildar's order no: 356 of the 1st instant to the Sekdar of Belamangala directing him to submit Jafti patti for the petitioner's holding and the crop thereon.

On the 30th July 1892 Sekdar of Belamangala reported to the Amildar that the petitioner is a defaulter for a large sum of Revenue for the current and the previous years and that he is alienating some of his lands &c. (Vide copy of Sekdar's report no: 141 of 30th July 1892).

US

on the 18th July 1892 with petitioners appeal).

Lt-IV

On the 19th July 1892 Amildar issued a notice to the petitioner calling on him to make good the amount of deficiency in the accounts of Belamangala and 5 villages viz Rs: 1124-1-6 during the time petitioner did the duty of Sanbogne and Rs: 853-7-8 during the time of Appayya Sanbogne former (Vide original notice dated 19th July 1892).

Lt V

On the 26th July 1892 the petitioner submitted a petition to the Deputy Commr stating that the Amildar was not certain of the Amount of the deficiency as he demanded different amounts at different times viz 3802-14-9 on the 19th July 1892, 1980-4-2 on the 11th July 1892 and 1977-9-2 as per notice of the 19th July 1892 and that he would not pay anything unless he is personally

in the shape of deficiency.

The petitioner applied for the trial order of the Deputy Commissioner on the above explanation but he refused with the Endorsement No. 21 of the 14th October 92 that the trial order has not been yet passed.

Exhibit VII

On the 20th November 1892 petitioner personally appeared before the deputy Commissioner and applied on the 30th for the Copy of the deposition, but the copy of petitioner's petition has not been furnished with a copy & submitted a reminder on the 15th instant and received it to the Deputy Commissioner, by my relation Narayanappa who was, from his own statement treated most shamefully by the Commissioner. Copy was not furnished.

Exhibit VIII

Copy of Amildar's order No: 356 which refers to order

(over)

as the petitioner apprehends that the District Revenue authorities take summary actions against the Revenue Code, Rules and procedure.

Petitioner begs to remain

Honored Sir

Your most Obt: Servt

galore

Seergazi P.O. Kadamapea

62

(Signed) C. Madiah
Dy. Commissioner
20/11/92

(General Serial No. 32.)

1892.

(12)

No. 1887

Name of Petitioner. Khasappa Shanbhogru

Village. Bettampala

Taluk. Davangere

District. Kadur

Date of Arzi. 18th January 1893

Date of Receipt. 23 Do

Date of Disposal.

No. of Enclosures. 1

L R 150-92-7

ABSTRACT.

Appeal against the Deputy Commissioner's order No. 661 of 5th January 1893 on the land matter of Bettampala collected from Betkh

SMA
25/1/93

Stamp duty Rs 5
Copy of order produced
In time.

Proceedings to be called for with report

SM
23/2

Mysore Govt. Central Press Bangalore—7-9-92,—1000.

No. 1531-1584

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE,

PETITION DEPARTMENT,

6-5-1893

Endorsement granted to Shambhag Kadarappa (10)
of Betamangala Bowringpet Taluk

in reply to his Petitions Registered No. 1531 & 1584 dated 19 ~~Dec~~ and 23 December 1892 praying that the proceedings relating to the recovery of the public moneys due by him may be examined and a thorough enquiry held in regard to the several sums claimed

Petitioner is informed that he should appear in person or by Vakil before the Deputy Commr and represent his case to that officer, and that if he is not satisfied with the order passed by the Dy Commr he may appear against it in due course.

The Stamps are returned herewith by order

L.R. 150-92-9

Draft-
Communication
No. 18373
1382

for Chief Secretary

A copy of the above is forwarded to the Dy Commr Kolar District with reference to his letter Camp No. 35 dated 28th ultimo

"By Order"

for Chief S

Mysore Govt. Central Press, Bangalore.—9-2-93—2000.

Deputy Commissioner's Office,
Kolar District,

3496/844 an Office

Dated the 11th May 1893.

13 (14)

To

The Chief Secretary to the
Dewan of Mysore

Sir,

With reference to your official Memorandum No = Ref = 1091 dated the 27th February 1893 forwarding for report a petition from Kadarappa, late Shanbhogue of Betamangala, Bowringpet Taluk, I have the honor to state that some of the lands belonging to the Petitioner were sold by public auction on the 21st December 1892 in satisfaction of the arrears of revenue amounting to Rupees 238-4-6 due by him to Betamangala village from Sawadhan (1888-89) to Khara (1891-92) and the Proceedings having been submitted to this office by the Amildar for orders, the sale has been confirmed by me.

To return enclosures.

2. The Petitioner disputes the correctness of the balance shewn against him which he states should be only Rupees 56-12-6 but he has adduced no satisfactory evidence to substantiate his plea beyond addressing a number of petitions containing

vague and unfounded assertions. If he had any doubts as to the amount due by him to Government, it was his business to have appeared before the Amildar who would have explained to him how he was liable to pay the balance demanded of him. His failure to do so clearly indicates that he was trying to gain time and had no intention of paying up the government dues.

3. In para 2 of his petition under report, the Petitioner contends that 4 year's Kandayam should have been recovered from Basireddi on account of certain lands mortgaged by him to the latter but the Amildar reports that these lands having come into the possession of Basireddi in Vikruti (1890-91) by means of a civil court sale at which he purchased the same, the Survey assessment due thereon for that year and Khara (1891-92) amounting to Rupees 22-2-11 exclusive of remissions has under the orders of this office been recovered from the auction purchaser and duly credited to the Petitioner's account. The Survey assessment of the aforesaid lands has fallen far short of the old assessment which amounted to Rupees 57-2-4 and this difference is explained by the Amildar to be due to portions of the lands having during the Survey been

7 (11)

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE.
PETITION DEPARTMENT
RECD. N. 1887
DATE 23-1-93

To,

The Honorable Commr
Bangalore

A.S. No 106
92-93

Honored Sirs,

I beg to submit this appeal against Deputy Commrs order no: 666 of 5th January 1893 referred to in the accompanying original order no: 19 of 11th instant received by me yesterday.

I The Amildar disobeying the orders of his superior officer dated 6th April 1891 has recovered from Observers Revenue for 2 years minor & for 4 years from Sarvadhari (Exhibit B).

II The Amildar has failed to observe the preliminary steps requisite in the matter of recovering the arrears by Coercive measures

III The Amildar has failed to furnish the appellant with Copies of record in the matter of the sale now appealed against and the Deputy Commissioner gave no consideration to the appellants complaint in the matter against the Amildar -

My plea is that the Honourable Councillors will be pleased to call for the entire record and peruse the irregularities of the District Revenue authorities and determine the amount of arrears due by the appellant which the appellant asserts to be Rs: 56.12.6 and not Rs: 232.14.6.

(Signed) Kadarappa

Vegamma

8th January 1993.

Exhibit D

ਨਕਲ

ਦਫਤਰ ਤਹਸੀਲਦਾਰ ਸਾਹਿਬ ਜਗਰਾਉਂ

ਮਿਤੀ 22-12-2021

ਸ਼ਿਕਾਇਤ ਕਰਤਾ ਸ਼ਮਸ਼ੇਰ ਸਿੰਘ ਪੁੱਤਰ ਸੁਰਜਣ ਸਿੰਘ ਵਾਸੀ ਪਿੰਡ ਸੁਧਾਰ ਤਹਸੀਲ ਜਗਰਾਉਂ ਜਿਲ੍ਹਾ ਲੁਧਿਆਣਾ

ਬਨਾਮ

ਸ਼ਿਕਾਇਤ ਕਰਤਾ ਵੱਲੋਂ ਇਹ ਸ਼ਿਕਾਇਤ ਕੀਤੀ ਗਈ ਹੈ ਕਿ ਉਸ ਦੀ ਮਾਤਾ ਸ੍ਰੀਮਤੀ ਸੁਰਜੀਤ ਕੌਰ ਪਤਨੀ ਸੁਰਜਣ ਸਿੰਘ ਵਾਸੀ ਪਿੰਡ ਸੁਧਾਰ ਤਹਸੀਲ ਜਗਰਾਉਂ ਜਿਲ੍ਹਾ ਲੁਧਿਆਣਾ ਦੀ ਮਿਤੀ 27-11-2021 ਨੂੰ ਮੌਤ ਹੋ ਗਈ ਹੈ ਅਤੇ ਉਸ ਦੀ ਮਾਤਾ ਦੀ ਮੌਤ ਤੋਂ ਬਾਅਦ ਉਸ ਦੇ ਪਿਤਾ ਸੁਰਜਣ ਸਿੰਘ ਵੱਲੋਂ ਉਸ ਦੀ ਮਾਤਾ ਦੇ ਸਾਰੇ ਗਹਿਣੇ ਅਤੇ ਨਕਦੀ ਜੋ ਕਿ ਉਸ ਦੀ ਮਾਤਾ ਦੇ ਵਿਆਹ ਸਮੇਂ ਉਸ ਦੇ ਨਾਨਕਿਆਂ ਵੱਲੋਂ ਦਿੱਤੀ ਗਈ ਸੀ ਅਤੇ ਉਸ ਦੀ ਮਾਤਾ ਦੇ ਸਾਰੇ ਕੱਪੜੇ ਵੀ ਆਪਣੇ ਕਬਜ਼ੇ ਵਿੱਚ ਲੈ ਲਏ ਹਨ ਅਤੇ ਉਸ ਦੇ ਪਿਤਾ ਵੱਲੋਂ ਉਸ ਦੀ ਮਾਤਾ ਦੇ ਗਹਿਣੇ ਅਤੇ ਨਕਦੀ ਅਤੇ ਕੱਪੜੇ ਉਸ ਨੂੰ ਨਹੀਂ ਦਿੱਤੇ ਜਾ ਰਹੇ

S.no.	Extent A:C	market value	highest bid
132	4-8	60-0	16-0-0
145	4-24	180-0	60-0-0
328.	0-18	135-0	60-0-0

Excepting the 2nd all the others now sold are very low prices are wet lands of high value. The share of the standing crop in these lands has been estimated as 15 Candies or Rs: 150 Thus you perceive how I am minished by the Sale.

7 I beg further to submit that the officer who held the sale made the following collections:—

From Subrahmanya - - - - 16-0-0
Beram Beg - - - - - - 8-0-0
Ankamma Kolli Immappa - 21-0-0

The collection, I hear, is for Survey numbers 206, 290 and 491 respectively. The persons who paid the money have no interest of any kind in the lands you see they pay Rs advanced. This has created a lot of ill feeling and I apprehend that they will remove the crop taking advantage of my absence. This is one of the many different sorts of injustice done to me by the Ruling Authorities. As the Amildar and the Police Inspector are leagued against me I will not be surprised if one fine night my house and my other properties are plundered in the day light.

8 I am forced to enquire now that the Revenue Code and Rules in force in the Province are obsolete in the Bombay patel Ruling and Especially in my peculiar case. I am sure you would not have tolerated this shameful action of the Ruling Officials if the matters had been correctly represented to you. It is an accep

of such actions that misunderstandings arise between District Officers and their subjects

9 The Amildar of Bowring pete being however determined to oust me (one of your Six hundred thousand subjects) out of the Taluq introduces fresh matters one after the other against me and places me in a most awkward position. The Amildar does not know that his office is not hereditary in the Bowring pete Taluq and that such improper conduct on his part would take a most unpleasant turn in the long run.

10 Under these circumstances I beg most respectfully to represent to you that you will be pleased to set aside the improper sale conducted by the Amildar and grant me time on personal security for Rs: 108-4-2, my arrears. I further request you to order the Amildar to account for the Rs: 154 recovered from the sale of the lands in the Enjoyment of (Boisrandi) (vide para 3 above) and to recover as well the balance from him.

I beg etc.

(S) Kadiragesa.

27th December 92

(by Rangaswamy 3 Rs 20)

		Rs.	as.	ps
Venkata Ramaya for S. No.	214	6	15	0
Subrahmanaya Aya	443	15	15	0
Pedara Hanuma	430	12	5	7
Venkata	206, 844	7	7	3
Siche Hanuma	469	14	8	7
Muniga	101	9	15	3
Biranbage	290	0	8	6
Muniappa	471	20	6	9
	Total	89	1	11

In para 7 of the enclosed ~~petition~~ petition I have explained that collections made from Subrahmanaya Aya, Biranbage and Muniappa (Rs 36-14-3) are not from my ryots. I will not under the circumstances represented therein, agree to that amount being taken into my credit. I have thus to make good the following

Total arrears	Rs 108	0	2
Deduct as per above explanation	51	3	8
Balance	56	12	6

This amount of Rs 56-12-6 I shall pay up at the Taluq Treasury in full adjustment of my arrears immediately I receive your orders. I solicit therefore that you will be pleased to set aside the illegal sale conducted by the Taluq authorities simply for the sake of annoying me and putting me into all sorts of unnecessary expenditure.

I beg Etc.

10th January/93 (Sd) Kadarappa

(by surgeon 17 Vth)

ಕಾರ್ಯಾಲಯ ಸಹಾಯಕ ಆಯುಕ್ತರು ಮಡಿಕೇರಿ ಉಪವಿಭಾಗ ಮಡಿಕೇರಿ

ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ: ಕಂದಾಯ/ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ/ಎಸ್.ಆರ್-೨೦೨/೨೦೦೨-೦೩ ದಿನಾಂಕ: 8-3-93

ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ: ಕಂದಾಯ/ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ/ಎಸ್.ಆರ್-೨೦೨/೨೦೦೨-೦೩ ದಿನಾಂಕ: 30-1-93 ರಂತೆ ಮಡಿಕೇರಿ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು ಕಸಬಾ ಹೋಬಳಿ ಕಾಲೂರು ಗ್ರಾಮದ ಸರ್ವೆ ನಂ. 108/2 ರಲ್ಲಿ 2.00 ಎಕರೆ ಜಮೀನನ್ನು ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ.ಎಂ. ಪೂವಯ್ಯ ಮತ್ತು ಇತರರಿಗೆ ಮಂಜೂರು ಮಾಡಿರುವ ಬಗ್ಗೆ.

ಉಲ್ಲೇಖ: ಮಾನ್ಯ ಜಿಲ್ಲಾಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳ ಜ್ಞಾಪನ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ: ಕಂದಾಯ/ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ/ಎಸ್.ಆರ್-೨೦೨/೨೦೦೨-೦೩ ದಿನಾಂಕ: 30-1-93

ಮೇಲ್ಕಂಡ ಉಲ್ಲೇಖಿತ ಜ್ಞಾಪನದಲ್ಲಿ ಮಡಿಕೇರಿ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು ಕಸಬಾ ಹೋಬಳಿ ಕಾಲೂರು ಗ್ರಾಮದ ಸರ್ವೆ ನಂ. 108/2 ರಲ್ಲಿ 2.00 ಎಕರೆ ಜಮೀನನ್ನು ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ.ಎಂ. ಪೂವಯ್ಯ ಮತ್ತು ಇತರರಿಗೆ ಮಂಜೂರು ಮಾಡಿರುವ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಆದೇಶಿಸಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಸದರಿ ಜಮೀನಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದಂತೆ ಈ ಕೆಳಕಂಡ ಷರತ್ತುಗಳನ್ನು ವಿಧಿಸಿ ಮಂಜೂರು ಮಾಡಿರುವ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಆದೇಶಿಸಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ.

ಷರತ್ತುಗಳು

1. ಸರ್ವೆ ನಂ. 108/2 ರಲ್ಲಿ 2.00 ಎಕರೆ ಜಮೀನನ್ನು ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ.ಎಂ. ಪೂವಯ್ಯ ಮತ್ತು ಇತರರಿಗೆ ಮಂಜೂರು ಮಾಡಿರುವ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಆದೇಶಿಸಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ.
2. ಸರ್ವೆ ನಂ. 108/2 ರಲ್ಲಿ 2.00 ಎಕರೆ ಜಮೀನನ್ನು ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ.ಎಂ. ಪೂವಯ್ಯ ಮತ್ತು ಇತರರಿಗೆ ಮಂಜೂರು ಮಾಡಿರುವ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಆದೇಶಿಸಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ.
3. ಸರ್ವೆ ನಂ. 108/2 ರಲ್ಲಿ 2.00 ಎಕರೆ ಜಮೀನನ್ನು ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ.ಎಂ. ಪೂವಯ್ಯ ಮತ್ತು ಇತರರಿಗೆ ಮಂಜೂರು ಮಾಡಿರುವ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಆದೇಶಿಸಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ.
4. ಸರ್ವೆ ನಂ. 108/2 ರಲ್ಲಿ 2.00 ಎಕರೆ ಜಮೀನನ್ನು ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ.ಎಂ. ಪೂವಯ್ಯ ಮತ್ತು ಇತರರಿಗೆ ಮಂಜೂರು ಮಾಡಿರುವ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಆದೇಶಿಸಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ.

ಸಹಾಯಕ ಆಯುಕ್ತರು
ಮಡಿಕೇರಿ ಉಪವಿಭಾಗ
ಮಡಿಕೇರಿ

ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ: ಕಂದಾಯ/ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ/ಎಸ್.ಆರ್-೨೦೨/೨೦೦೨-೦೩ ದಿನಾಂಕ: 8-3-93

ಪ್ರತಿ:

1. ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ.ಎಂ. ಪೂವಯ್ಯ ಮತ್ತು ಇತರರು, ಕಾಲೂರು ಗ್ರಾಮ, ಮಡಿಕೇರಿ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು.
2. ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ.ಎಂ. ಪೂವಯ್ಯ ಮತ್ತು ಇತರರು, ಕಾಲೂರು ಗ್ರಾಮ, ಮಡಿಕೇರಿ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು.
3. ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ.ಎಂ. ಪೂವಯ್ಯ ಮತ್ತು ಇತರರು, ಕಾಲೂರು ಗ್ರಾಮ, ಮಡಿಕೇರಿ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು.
4. ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ.ಎಂ. ಪೂವಯ್ಯ ಮತ್ತು ಇತರರು, ಕಾಲೂರು ಗ್ರಾಮ, ಮಡಿಕೇರಿ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು.
5. ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ.ಎಂ. ಪೂವಯ್ಯ ಮತ್ತು ಇತರರು, ಕಾಲೂರು ಗ್ರಾಮ, ಮಡಿಕೇರಿ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು.
6. ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ.ಎಂ. ಪೂವಯ್ಯ ಮತ್ತು ಇತರರು, ಕಾಲೂರು ಗ್ರಾಮ, ಮಡಿಕೇರಿ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು.
7. ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ.ಎಂ. ಪೂವಯ್ಯ ಮತ್ತು ಇತರರು, ಕಾಲೂರು ಗ್ರಾಮ, ಮಡಿಕೇರಿ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು.
8. ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ.ಎಂ. ಪೂವಯ್ಯ ಮತ್ತು ಇತರರು, ಕಾಲೂರು ಗ್ರಾಮ, ಮಡಿಕೇರಿ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು.
9. ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ.ಎಂ. ಪೂವಯ್ಯ ಮತ್ತು ಇತರರು, ಕಾಲೂರು ಗ್ರಾಮ, ಮಡಿಕೇರಿ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು.
10. ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ.ಎಂ. ಪೂವಯ್ಯ ಮತ್ತು ಇತರರು, ಕಾಲೂರು ಗ್ರಾಮ, ಮಡಿಕೇರಿ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು.

ಸಹಾಯಕ ಆಯುಕ್ತರು
ಮಡಿಕೇರಿ ಉಪವಿಭಾಗ
ಮಡಿಕೇರಿ

103

107 (167)

The Deputy Commissioner
Kolar District

L.R. 150-92-1

4069 dy 1-9-93.
P368

His letter no 3496/844, dated
May last, reporting on the
tion of Kadirappa, late
nbhog of Betmangala
wringpet-Taluk

With reference to the above
the honour to request that
Deputy Commissioner will
o good as to submit the
ine proceedings, ~~and to~~
~~notice of hearing of the appeal~~
~~is posted to 2nd November~~
~~by to Basi Reddi the~~
~~abaser~~ connected with the
s complained of by the Petitioner.

Notice to Basi Reddi
Purchaser should be
issued from this Office
as usual
BR 1/9

By Order

Draft
mil order) Chief Secretary.

108

Draft for approval

(General Serial No. 30.)

189 .

From

The Chief Secretary
to the Dewan of Mysore.

To

Dated 1st

Despatched 2 —— Sept/93

Received

Enclosures No.

General No. 4069
Pol No. 368

References to be marked.

Mysore Govt. C. Press, Bangalore.—9-1-93.—3,000.